

REMARKS

The following remarks are submitted again here after an Advisory Action mailed March 17, 2008, in which the Examiner declined to enter the amendment, stating that the amendments required a new search. Applicant thereafter filed an RCE and resubmitted the Amendments and the remarks herein which generated a Notice of Non-Compliance which is being addressed hereto in the Response to the Notice of Non-Compliance.

Applicant respectfully requests the amendments and remarks being submitted herein, be entered accordingly, as the current statement of the position of the application.

These remarks were originally submitted February 28, 2008, in response to the Office Action, made final, mailed December 28, 2007, with respect to the above-identified application (hereinafter the "Application"). The Examiner has rejected all the pending claims, commenting that Applicant's arguments of November 2, 2007 have been considered, but are moot in view of new grounds of rejection. Reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested. The original response was submitted for filing within two months after the date of the subject Office Action.

Applicants request the Examiner consider the following remarks and withdraw all rejections. In the event that the Examiner does not find the claims as presently amended to be in a form suitable for allowance, Applicant respectfully submits that it may be beneficial to discuss the pending claims with the Examiner.

Applicant has presently amended claims 1, 2, 3, 24, 25, 26 and 27. Each of these amendments is supported in the specification. These amendments are to more clearly claim the present invention, and Applicant thanks the Examiner for highlighting certain points of possible ambiguity or lack of clarity in the claims before these amendments.

In reviewing the subject specification and associated claims, and based upon the Examiner's comments regarding potential issues with antecedent basis and the need to reword, explain and clarify various terms used in the specification and claims, Applicant has amended several claims to remove any potential confusion and to ensure proper antecedent basis. Applicant believes the various amendments address the issues currently raised by the Examiner, and requests due consideration and allowance of all claims.

Withdrawn - Rejection of Specification

Applicant acknowledges that the objection to the specification has been withdrawn, and thanks the Examiner.

Withdrawn Claim Rejections – 35 USC §112, second paragraph Claims 4, 5, 10, 12, 25, 29

Applicant acknowledges that the rejection based on 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, has been withdrawn, and Applicant thanks the Examiner.

Present Claim Rejections – 35 USC §112, second paragraph

The Examiner has rejected claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Specifically, the Examiner comments on certain recitations in Claim 1.

The Examiner has also indicated that there is insufficient antecedent basis for the limitation, "message protocol" in Claims 4 and 5. Applicant thanks the Examiner for pointing out the insufficient antecedent basis; Applicant has amended Claims 4 and 5 to correct the antecedent basis, and respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw this rejection of claim 1, as amended.

Claims Rejection - 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

The Examiner has rejected all the pending claims under 35 U.S. C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over various combinations of references.

Claims Rejection - 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)
Claims 1-4, 11-12 and 25-28

In the first of these rejections, the Examiner has rejected claims 1-4, 11-12 and 25-28 as unpatentable over Yairi et al (USPPub 2004/0078424) in view of Kusuda (USPPub 2003/0088623). Applicant respectfully notes that claim 11 was previously canceled.

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of these claims in view of these references. Applicant has amended and will discuss in detail independent claims 1 and 25, as amended, in some detail. All others of these claims are dependent claims that depend respectively from independent claim 1 or 25, now amended. To the extent that independent Claims 1 and 25 of the claimed invention are patentable, dependent Claims 2-10, 12-24 and 26-33 are likewise allowable due to their respective dependency from Claims 1 and 25.

Yairi uses a very narrow pipe for single user to extract information from the Web in a manner that the small device and pipe simply cannot support in full bandwidth. Kusuda provides a tiny side channel in a relatively rich environment so that multiple users can synchronize simple communication. The present invention takes a small communication channel and provides an opportunity for connected users to selectively enrich a communication stream between them.

Claim 1, as amended, is directed to a system that includes a plurality of user devices, including a screen, and one or more application agents which are associated with an external application that can be activated through a corresponding agent to add some programmatic element to an existing communication between two or more users.

Yairi is totally different from this. Yairi facilitates communication between a relatively simple device or environment, such as a mobile phone, and a more complex environment such as the web. The Yairi intermediary application interprets simple commands from the simple environment, transforms that into a form suitable for the more complex environment, detects and retrieves information from the complex environment, and delivers that retrieved information

in a suitable simple form back to the simple device. This is a single user process, although multiple users can use the application to have independent instances of such communication, such as user 1 interfacing with web session 1, user 2 with web session 2, and so forth. Applicant has searched diligently for and found no suggestion in Yairi of connecting any two or more users together, or even suggesting the possibility that a user might want to communicate with a different user. Please see also the discussion of Yairi below in connection with the rejection of claims 13-20, 22 and 29-30 (Office Action pages 10-15).

Kusuda has only a very superficial similarity to the present invention. It is a reasonable example of the "Existing instant messaging client applications" cited in the background of the present Application. See page 5, line 6. Kusuda is directed to providing an ancillary communication channel, specifically a "chat" with the intention of enabling two users to independently view a common document such as a web page or other information, then to establish a communication channel that is represented by a computer screen window in which one user can type and another user can view that communication. Kusuda specifically does not refer to a shared whiteboard, since Kusuda talks at length about the challenges of directing multiple users to the same point of interest in the document under review (cf. paragraph 0009, Page 1, first column, first sentence). This can involve more than two users and in fact can broadcast to a large number of users. In a typical configuration, and connected user can type an entry that will then be visible to all other connected users on that chat. A single user can have multiple chats, for example one to a customer and a separate, independent chat with a supervisor. Here, the external or alternate application is the chat program, not the feature rich program. This chat program may be configured with clients on each user's machine, or centrally in a Software as a Service (SaaS) hosted application, or some combination of both.

The present invention is different from either of these. The present invention is directed to a software agent that makes an additional service accessible during and in conjunction with an IM session, this service providing more than the simple text messaging of a typical IM communication. This can start with a

simple IM communication between users, such as for example a Kusuda-like communication, then invoke an agent to activate an additional service to provide an enhanced IM session (rich experience instant message, RIM, page 10, line 3 and discussion of Fig. 1A). This goes far beyond what Kusuda contemplates or suggests, both in initiating or utilizing a richer channel of communication as well as initiating or utilizing more than one channel of communication (in at least some implementations of the present invention). Yairi lets the mobile user manipulate web research but with no enhancement of the users interface or experience and in fact removing richness from the user experience, functioning more like a command line interface and getting essentially none of the richness of the web sources being interrogated by the Yairi's IM server.

Applicant respectfully submits the difficulty of conceiving of any way anyone skilled in the art would combine Yairi and Kusuda at all, much less to make anything like the present invention. A recipe for making cake and a process for making coffee do not in anyway suggest having cake with coffee even though many people would choose to do so. They choose so not because the cake recipe mentions having a beverage (it wouldn't suggest such) but merely because this is one of a myriad of possible combinations of food and beverages. The Examiner has not pointed to anything in either Yairi or Kusuda that would suggest or lead one skilled in the art to even consider these together and the only tenuous connection seems to be that they are in the field of computers and communication, as are many thousands of other patents. Claim 1 as amended is clearly distinct from either of these references, alone or in combination, and Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw this rejection and allow claim 1.

Claim 25, as amended, is directed to a method of practicing the invention, much like the description of the system of the invention described just above. Claim 25 as amended is clearly distinct from either of these references, alone or in combination, and Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw this rejection and allow claim 25.

Although the other claims are dependent on what, as amended, are distinctly patentable claims 1 and 25, Applicant will discuss the dependent claims briefly.

With regard to claim 2, Applicants have clarified that "third party" is not a critical feature of the invention – the significance is that the enhancing application is distinct from the primary, simple IM application, whether that enhancing application is local or is external on the Web or some other location. In any event, Yairi diminishes the user experience of the external resources whereas the present invention enriches the user experience by expanding beyond the simple text mode of IM.

With regard to claim 3, these are indeed useful examples of enhancements to a simple IM message, whereas Yairi merely distills any enhancements and extracts simple text messages.

With regard to claim 4, among the differences already discussed, the Yairi application provides information only to one user while the present invention provides enriched information to multiple users simultaneously in a linked and coordinated communication.

With regard to claim 12, which was amended previously to depend from claim 1 (claim 11 was canceled in the first Applicant response), this is directed to details of the application agents and how they may be registered (known) or unregistered (unknown or perhaps needing some special activation for use with the implementation of this invention), and does not in any way detract from the many distinctions already discussed over the cited Yairi.

With regard to claim 26, see comments just above in connection with claim 2. Also, coupling to the Internet is extremely well known but is not the point of novelty.

With regard to claim 27, see comments just above in connection with claim 3.

With regard to claim 28, an interactive service would be still more distinct from Yairi than the distinctions already discussed for the independent claim 25.

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of these claims in view of these references. Applicant has amended claims 1 and 25 and these claims are distinct from Yairi and Kusuda, alone or in any combination. All others of these claims are dependent claims that depend respectively from independent claim 1 or 25, now amended. To the extent that independent Claims 1 and 25 of the claimed invention are patentable, dependent Claims 1-4, 12 and 26-28 are likewise allowable due to their respective dependency from Claims 1 and 25. Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner withdraw the rejection and allow of all these claims.

Claims Rejection - 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)
Claim 5

In the second of these rejections (page 7), the Examiner has rejected claim 5 as unpatentable over Yairi et al (USPPub 2004/0078424) in view of Kusuda (USPPub 2003/0088623) in further view of McMullin et al. (USPPub 2004/0125924).

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of this claim 5 in view of these references. Applicant has discussed above independent claims 1 and 25, as amended, in some detail. Claim 5 is a dependent claims that depends from independent claim 1, now amended. To the extent that independent Claim 1 and is patentable, dependent Claim 5 is likewise allowable due to its dependency from Claim 1.

The Examiner speaks here and many times hereafter of "the modified Yairi reference" but does not explain how Yairi is modified in some way. Applicant will assume that the Examiner means the Yairi reference in its printed form, perhaps taken in conjunction with whatever references the Examiner happens to cite in each section. The MPEP does speak of reference teachings being modified in order to teach a claim, but there is an express requirement that "The modification must be one which would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made. See MPEP §2131-§2146 for guidance ..." MPEP § 702.6 V, page 700-23, 8th edition (Sept 2007). Further, in section 707,

page 700-112, right hand column, the MPEP states: "For rejections under 35 U.S.C., the way in which a reference is modified or plural references are combined should be set out." Applicant respectfully submits that the Examiner's discussion of how the reference(s) make claim 5 obvious are unduly terse, or perhaps are characterized in some short hand form that is not evident to the Applicant. However, if the Examiner agrees that the claims as presently amended are distinct from the references, this concern will be moot.

McMullin et al. include claims to providing information about a call to both a call recipient and a call placer (caller), but the information seems to be quite limited – Caller ID, perhaps some small amount of text relating to the other party, such as an address book or perhaps proprietary information about the other party. This is not a communication that involves a message entry window for a user to enter data (claim 1), or a selection window or selection apparatus. On page 3, paragraph 34, McMullin et al. comment that their "call destination information" can be in the form of an IM or other message files.

This however is not an ancillary or external application that is invoked, this is the primary program in all its glory. There is no selective activation in McMullin – there is a configuration (perhaps if one reads the reference more closely than is necessary in distinguishing it) so the call information is shared by *some* method, but the Examiner has not noted any suggestion in McMullin et al. that a user accesses an application agent which is then associated with yet another application (the external application) – and this is just in claim 1 of the present invention, which is of course part of claim 5.

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of Claim 5 in view of these references. Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner withdraw the rejection and allow of all these claims.

Claims Rejection - 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claim 6

In the third of these rejections (page 7), the Examiner has rejected claim 6 as unpatentable over Yairi et al (USPPub 2004/0078424) in view of Kusuda

(USPPub 2003/0088623) in further view of Bjoernsen et al. (USPPub 2004/0174392).

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of this claim 6 in view of these references, in light of the claims as currently amended. Applicant has discussed above independent claims 1 and 25, as amended, in some detail. Claim 6 is a dependent claims that depends from independent claim 1, now amended. To the extent that independent Claim 1 and is patentable, dependent Claim 6 is likewise allowable due to its dependency from Claim 1.

Bjoernsen provides a menu of available collaboration materials, but this appears to be little more than a listing and perhaps preconfiguration of these various modes of communication. It appears that the user needs to have active account information on her own computer, and a second collaborating user needs to do the same, in order to use each of these various menu tools. However, it is not clear how this might be considered to be running "in conjunction with" the menu or primary application, which is a feature of the present invention.

The Examiner asserts that it would have been obvious to create a Yairi system including a buddy list but provides no support. The Applicant respectfully reminds the Examiner that Yairi's "buddy list" relates to bookmarking web sites and has nothing to do with any other user or even the phone subscriber's internal phone address list (see discussion below regarding the rejection on pages 10-15 of the Office Action). Remembering that Yairi enables a user to access web information through a very primitive and limited interface and with no hint of collaboration or awareness of other users, Applicant respectfully submits that any such combination based on Yairi would be extremely unlikely – taking the modern use of "buddy list," call a friend for help when accessing the web? Googling some obscure item of interest, perhaps, but checking with a buddy to see what they know about restaurants or gas stations in the area the user happens to be searching seems very, very remote as a likely or even reasonable mode of use and certainly remote as an innovation that would be of any interest

to one skilled in the art – in any event hardly “obvious” in any realistic sense of the term.

Applicant has amended many claims, including claim 1 on which claim 6 depends. Applicant posits that claims 1 and 6 as amended are patentably distinct from, and not obvious in light of, these references. These claims are distinct from Yaida and Kusuda with Bjorensen, alone or in any combination.

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of these claims in view of these references. Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner withdraw the rejection and allow claim 6.

**Claims Rejection - 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)
Claims 7-10**

In the fourth of these rejections (page 8), the Examiner has rejected claims 7-10 as unpatentable over Yairi et al (USPPub 2004/0078424) in view of Kusuda (USPPub 2003/0088623) in further view of Bjoernsen et al. (USPPub 2004/0174392) in further view of Dickerman et al. (USPPub 2003/0177184).

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of claims 7-10 in view of these references. Applicant has discussed above independent claims 1 and 25, as amended, in some detail. Claims 7-10 are dependent claims that depend from independent claim 1, now amended. To the extent that independent Claim 1 is patentable, dependent Claims 7-10 are likewise allowable due to the dependency of each ultimately from Claim 1.

Unduly broad claim language may well run afoul of a good many references. Applicant submits that the claims as amended are distinct from all of the cited references, alone or in any combination.

However, Applicant notes here briefly (also relevant for some subsequent responses) that suggestions of combining large numbers of references strains credulity with the increasing numbers of references. One must contemplate just how much art from diverse areas might be used realistically by an inventor seeking to develop a new invention and then one must make a credible

estimation of the likelihood that an inventor would truly find and plan to combine whatever series of references is posited. In these days of ready internet access it is not difficult looking backward to find search terms in widely dispersed references, but this does not mean that someone looking forward in time would assemble such a panoply of references, or even if presented with them would make such a combination. Presumably various convoluted aggregations could be applied against almost any innovation, and the logical result is that innovation would grind to a crunching halt.

The Examiner points to page 7 paragraph 36 of Dickerman. However, note right in the summary of the invention of Dickerman: "The arranged peer-to-peer session is functionally independent of the instant message service." Page 1, paragraph 0009, end. This is expressly contradictory to the language of claim 1, as amended, that the external application run "in conjunction with" the client messaging application. Thus Dickerman expressly teaches away from the present claims as amended. One skilled in the art would immediately reject Dickerman in comparing or contemplating the present invention, or if taking Dickerman would presume the present invention to be infeasible (but it is quite feasible), so either path leads to the conclusion that the Dickerman reference does not in any way or in any combination make any portion of the present invention obvious.

Even if the process of Dickerman paragraph 0036 were relevant to the present invention, this does not take away from the differences elaborated above where Claim 1, as amended, is patentably distinct from the references cited against it.

The Examiner again returns to the suggestion that one skilled in the art would use Yairi, a single user, non-collaborative application, to imagine inviting other users to join. Applicant respectfully restates that this is an incredibly remote extension, and hardly obvious alone or in any combination.

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of these claims in view of these references. Applicant has amended claims 1 and 25 and these claims are

distinct from Yaida and Kusuda and Bjoernsen and Dickerman, alone or in any combination. All others of these claims are dependent claims that depend from independent claim 1, now amended. To the extent that independent Claim 1 of the claimed invention is patentable, dependent Claims 7-10 are likewise allowable due to their dependency from Claim 1. Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner withdraw the rejection and allow of all these claims.

Claims Rejection - 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)
Claims 13-20, 22 and 29-30

In the fifth of these rejections (pages 10-15), the Examiner has rejected claims 13-20, 22 and 29-30 as unpatentable over Yairi et al (USPPub 2004/0078424) in view of Kusuda (USPPub 2003/0088623) in further view of Pennock et al. (USPN 6,807,562).

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of these claims in view of these references. Applicant has amended and discussed independent claims 1 and 25, as amended, in some detail. All others of these claims are dependent claims that depend respectively from independent claim 1 or 25, now amended. To the extent that independent Claims 1 and 25 of the claimed invention are patentable, dependent Claims 13-20, 22 and 29-30 are likewise allowable due to their respective dependency from Claims 1 and 25.

Pennock teaches a communication system not unlike a conference calling setup. Basically, an external hardware device is prewired with a number of selectable channels for communicating. Using a game voice interface, a user can see candidate participants with whom the user may consider establishing voice communication. A host can invite others to join in a linked voice channel, presumably by menu indication, highlighting, or other well understood indicia means. The summary (col 2, line 45) suggests it is preferable for the invitation to include both text and voice content. Thus the software application offers address book-like and switchboard functions, while a secondary hardware system manages the voice communication, which is the primary goal of the system. The additional feature of easily switchable groups or "all" channels communication is

interesting but not relevant to the present invention. Pennock would not be considered a "client message application" by one skilled in the art. The Examiner does not suggest that Pennock is a §102 reference so we need not address any distinctions in great detail.

The Examiner studies the presently rejected claims 13-20, 22 and 29-30 in considerable detail. However, many if not all of these comments assert that it would have been obvious to take such and such action "to allow a user to select and register people to join a collaboration session." Applicant respectfully submits (and has discussed above) that Yairi is a single user system that does not in any way suggest connecting a user with ANY other user for any reason. The word stem "collab!" is not found in Yairi. The word stem "invit!" is not found in Yairi. The "buddy lists" of Yairi are very different from buddy lists in AOL IM sessions, and do NOT refer to living individuals. See, for example, page 3, paragraph 0025, about line 12, where "buddy" is first used. It is obviously in the context of what we know today as a bookmark in a web browser – "the user can store references (e.g. as a 'buddy') to services so that the user does not have to repeat the discovery process ...". In paragraph 0030 Yairi talks about adding new web services as a buddy, and in paragraph 39 a buddy is "a stock ticker symbol web service." The term is used about a dozen times, but Applicant was unable to find a single one that suggested a second user in communication with the first user. In fact, the web services of Yairi are not posited as users, and it does not seem reasonable to make such a stretch.

Thus Applicant submits that reading any sort of collaborative communication into Yairi is misplaced. Applicant respectfully submits there is nothing in Yairi that would suggest the combination of references or in any way make obvious the invention of any of claims 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 22, 29, or 30 (each presented by the Examiner with a discussion of how Yairi can be used to allow the incorporation of multiple people in a collaboration session).

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of these claims in view of these references. Applicant has amended claims 1 and 25 and these claims are

distinct from Yaida and Kusuda and Pennock, alone or in any combination. All others of these claims are dependent claims that depend respectively from independent claim 1 or 25, now amended. To the extent that independent Claims 1 and 25 of the claimed invention are patentable, dependent Claims 13-20, 22 and 29-30 are likewise allowable due to their respective dependency from Claims 1 and 25. Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner withdraw the rejection and allow of all these claims.

Claims Rejection - 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)
Claim 21

In the sixth of these rejections (page 15), the Examiner has rejected claim 21 as unpatentable over Yairi et al (USPPub 2004/0078424) in view of Kusuda (USPPub 2003/00882123) in further view of Pennock et al. (USPN 6,807,562) in further view of Bjoernsen et al. (USPPub 2004/0174392).

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of this claim 21 in view of these references, in light of the claims as currently amended. Applicant has discussed above independent claims 1 and 25, as amended, in some detail. Claim 21 is a dependent claims that depends from independent claim 1, now amended. To the extent that independent Claim 1 and is patentable, dependent Claim 21 is likewise allowable due to its dependency from Claim 1.

Applicant has discussed above how Yairi is not a relevant reference for anything relating to collaborative communications. Claim 12 is simply not "taught by Yairi" and the buddy list of Yairi has nothing to do with other users that might be involved in a collaborative session, thus combining it with teachings that may involve multiple users simply makes no sense.

Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner withdraw this rejection of claim 21, based on Claim 1 as amended, and allow claim 21.

Claims Rejection - 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)
Claims 23-24

In the seventh of these rejections (page 16), the Examiner has rejected Claims 23-24 as unpatentable over Yairi et al (USPPub 2004/0078424) in view of Kusuda (USPPub 2003/0088623) in further view of Dickerman et al. (USPPub 2003/0177184).

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of claims 23-24 in view of these references, in light of the claims as currently amended. Applicant has discussed above independent claims 1 and 25, as amended, in some detail. Claims 23-24 are dependent claims that depend from independent claim 1, now amended. To the extent that independent Claim 1 and is patentable, dependent Claims 23-24 are likewise allowable due to their dependency from Claim 1.

Applicant has discussed above how Yairi is not a relevant reference for anything relating to collaborative communications. Yairi alone or in any cited combination does not teach claim 1, as amended, and claims 23 and 24 are dependent on claim 1.

The section of Dickerman cited by the Examiner (paragraph 0036) is directed to an automated process of an application messenger client 108 setting up a client module 110 to present options to a user (human or machine), which can then be used to choose options to initiate a peer-to-peer communication (not through this 108/110 application but rather in a distinct channel).

The Examiner is correct that Yairi fails to state anything about inviting another user, but contrary to the Examiner's suggestion this is because Yairi has no concept at all of connecting users in any manner.

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of these claims in view of these references. Applicant has amended claims 1 and 25 and these claims are distinct from Yaida and Kusuda, alone or in any combination. All others of these claims are dependent claims that depend respectively from independent claim 1 or 25, now amended. To the extent that independent Claims 1 and 25 of the claimed invention are patentable, dependent Claims 23-24 are likewise allowable

due to their respective dependency from Claim 1. Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner withdraw the rejection and allow of all these claims.

Claims Rejection - 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)
Claims 31, 33

In the eighth of these rejections (page 17), the Examiner has rejected Claims 31, 33 as unpatentable over Yairi et al (USPPub 2004/0078424) in view of Kusuda (USPPub 2003/0088623) in further view of Bjoernsen et al. (USPPub 2004/0174392).

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of claims 31, 33 in view of these references, in light of the claims as currently amended. Applicant has discussed above independent claims 1 and 25, as amended, in some detail. Claims 31, 33 are dependent claims that depend from independent claim 25, now amended. To the extent that independent Claim 25 and is patentable, dependent Claims 31, 33 are likewise allowable due to their dependency from Claim 25.

The Examiner comments about a connection between claim 31 and claim 24 (tracing back to claim 1), but this typographical error in the application was corrected in the November amendment – claim 31 depends on claim 25, so the Examiner's comment is difficult to address. Similarly, claim 33 depends on claim 31 and ultimately on claim 25, with no connection at all to claim 24.

Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner withdraw this rejection and allow claims 31 and 33. The non-relevance of the cited art to claim 25 (and thus to its dependent claims) has been thoroughly discussed above.

Claims Rejection - 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)
Claim 32

In the ninth and final of these rejections (page 18), the Examiner has rejected claim 32 as unpatentable over Yairi et al (USPPub 2004/0078424) in view of Kusuda (USPPub 2003/00882123) in further view of Pennock et al. (USPN 6,807,562) in further view of Bjoernsen et al. (USPPub 2004/0174392) in further view of Dickerman et al. (USPPub 2003/0177184).

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of this claim 32 in view of these references, in light of the claims as currently amended. Applicant has discussed above independent claims 1 and 25, as amended, in some detail. Claim 32 is a dependent claims that depends from independent claim 25, now amended. To the extent that independent Claim 25 and is patentable, dependent Claim 32 is likewise allowable due to its dependency from Claim 25.

Applicant has discussed above how Yairi is not a relevant reference for anything relating to collaborative communications. Claim 32 is simply not "taught by Yairi" and Yairi has nothing to do with other users that might be involved in a collaborative session, thus combining Yairi with teachings that may involve multiple users simply makes no sense.

Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner withdraw this rejection of claim 21, based on Claim 1 as amended, and allow claim 21.

CONCLUSION

Applicant submits that independent Claims 1 and 25 are allowable for at least the reasons stated above. Accordingly, dependent Claims 2-10, 12-24 and 26-33 are allowable at least for the same reasons as their respective parent independent claims. Applicant has presently amended claims 1, 2, 3, 24, 25, 26 and 27.

All objections and rejections having been addressed, Applicant respectfully requests favorable consideration of the above remarks, withdrawal of the present rejections, and allowance of Claims 1-10 and 12-33. Applicant submits that the instant application is now in condition for allowance and respectfully solicits prompt notification of the same.